

*Who were the "Patan" or "Pathán" Sultáns of Dihlí?—By  
Major H. G. RAVERTY, Bombay Army (Retired).*

There is a very important period in the history of India requiring particular attention, and some strong remarks, in order to correct an error, which, since I have been engaged upon the translation of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náşirí*, has thrust itself upon my attention with greater force than ever.

It is an error which, for more than a century, has been handed down from one writer on Indian history to another, and re-echoed by others, their followers, upon all occasions. It has also misled many conscientious authors from their having placed reliance on the correctness of the translation of the commonest and most generally known history of India, in the Persian language, that is to be met with in India, and one which is tolerably well known to the generality of those educated Musalmáns who are acquainted with that language, and, to the translation of which nearly every English writer on Indian history has resorted down to this present day: and the error I refer to is still being industriously taught in our schools and colleges, both in England and in India.

I refer to the history of India, entitled *GULSHAN-I-IBRA'HI'MÍ*, by Muhammad Kásim Firishtah, and the translation I now more particularly glance at—I shall have to notice another, subsequently—is that by Dow, which I have noticed, and animadverted on, on a different subject, as well as on the present one, in my notes of the translation to the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náşirí*. The error to which I have alluded is the styling of *Ḳuṭb-ud-dín* of the Powerless Finger, the founder of—or rather the first of—and all the succeeding rulers of the kingdom of Dihlí, down even to the restoration of the Mughul emperor Humáyún, by the name of the "PATAN," "PATAH'N," or "AFGHA'N," dynasty.

This error, in the first instance, originated, I conceive, entirely from Dow, who, in 1768, published, what he styled, a translation of Firishtah's History, "the diction" of which he says, in his second edition, "in general, is rendered more connected, clear, elegant, and smooth." That translator also professes to have "clipped the wings of Firishtah's turgid expressions, and rendered his metaphors into common language," and further states that he "has given as few as possible of the faults of the author; but he has been cautious enough, not wittingly at least, to substitute any of his own in their place."

Notwithstanding these assertions, it was translated in such a manner as to make Gibbon suspect "that, through some odd fatality, the style of Firishtah had been improved by that of Ossian." Instead of clipping the wings of Firishtah, as Dow asserts, he is far more diffuse, and uses far more

turgid expressions; and, as the late Sir H. Elliot says in his BIOGRAPHICAL INDEX, “his own remarks are so interwoven as to convey an entirely different meaning from that which Firishtah intended,” and, “some of the commonest sentences are misunderstood, and the florid diction was occasionally used to gloss and embellish an imperfect comprehension of the original.” This is, by no means, an overdrawn picture of the translation, but a very mild one, as I shall now proceed to show, particularly respecting those passages which have caused Turkish slaves, Khaljís, Jaṭs, low caste Hindús, and Sayyids, to be turned into Paṭáns or Afgháns.

Dow commences his Preface with a blunder. He says (p. ix)—“Firishtah with great propriety begins the history of the Patan empire in Hindustan from the commencement of the kingdom of Ghizni.” Firishtah says not one word throughout his history of the “Patan empire,” much less the “Patan empire of Ghizni.” Then again he says: “The Afgans or Patans had been subjects to the imperial family of the Samania”; and he further asserts, that they, “Samania”, had revolted from the Caliphát [*khiláfat* probably], which, likewise, is not correct. See the Ṭabaḳát-i-Náṣiri’s account of the Sámání dynasty, or the account given by any other Asiatic writer, for the absolute contrary is the fact: they were most loyal to the Khalífahs, and acknowledged their suzerainty upon all occasions, and, indeed, received the investiture of their dominions from the Court of the Khalífahs of Baghdád. Dow winds up his paragraph by saying that “they [the ‘Afgans’] rebelled under Abistagi.” Such a statement is neither to be found in Firishtah, nor in the work of any other historian. Firishtah’s translator appears to have been as ignorant of the names of the personages therein mentioned as of the mode of spelling ‘Afghán’; for who would imagine that *Abistagi* is meant for Alb-Tigin, or would be so read by any one who could read the original for himself?

At page x of his Preface he says, “The kings of the Ghiznian Patans were obliged to relinquish their dominions in the north, and to transfer the seat of their empire to Lahore,” not because of the Ghúris, but because of the “Charizmian [*Khwárazmí*] rulers, and afterwards to Dihli.” Firishtah does not make any such assertion, nor will any other writer be found who states that any Ghaznawí ruler, much less a “Ghiznian Patan,” transferred his seat of empire to Dihlí.

Then he says [pp. x and xi]—“The uncommon strength of the Patan empire in Hindustan at this period may be easily accounted for. It was the policy of the adopted Turkish slaves [which he nevertheless turns into “Afgans” or “Patans”] of the family of Ghor to keep standing armies of Mountain Afghans, under their respective chiefs, who were invariably created Omrahs of the empire.” This the translator may have heard from ignorant Hindústánís with whom he came in contact, or he must have

judged from the state of India at the period in which he wrote, when Najíb-ud-daulah and other Patán chieftains kept bodies of their clansmen in pay. I challenge any one to name any single Afghán chief of any tribe of “mountain Afgháns,” who was one of the “Omrah” during the sway of the whole Turkish Slave Dynasty.

Dow takes his introduction partly from Firishtah’s introduction, although in the advertisement to the second of his translation he says, “Firishtah’s account of the ancient Indians, and the invasions of the Muhammandans, before the commencement of the Ghiznian Empire, is omitted, and an introduction substituted in its place, more satisfactory, succinct, and agreeable,” but a vast deal of the original is left out for obvious reasons; and a comparison of the two proves that the translation is full of mistakes, both in meaning and in the names of persons and places.

Under the reign of the Hindú king named Kíd and Kídár Ráj, whom Dow styles “Keda-rajá,” he has—“The mountaineers of Cabul and Candahar, *who are called Afghans or Patans*, advanced against Keda-rajá, and recovered all the provinces of which he had possessed himself on the Indus. We know no more of the transactions of Keda-rajá.”

Here is what Firishtah states [page 22 of the lithographed text, which I have chosen for facility of comparison by others]. “After some time the Khokhars and Janjúhíahs [the lithographed text here, however, has ككهكران and چوويه, which is evidently an error for كهوكهران and جلچوويه], tribes once very powerful, located in the hill tract of Makhíalah [the Salt Range] in the Sind-Ságar Doábah, who were amongst the [most] respectable zamíndárs of the Panjáb, combined with the dwellers in the plains [nomads] and the mountains [hill tribes], between Kábul and Kandahár [the name of this place *is not mentioned by any* author up to the time of, and including, the author of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náshirí*, and the place appears not to have been then known, at least by that name, until a considerable time subsequently], and came against Kíd-Ráj, and he, becoming helpless, left that tract of country in their possession. From that time, that people dispersed [the confederacy was broken], and the chief in each mountain tract appropriated it. *Apparently* (to Firishtah, but it is not entirely correct) *that people are the Afgháns which now are* [افغانان كه اكنون هسندند]. There is not a word more said about them. A proof of what the historian quoted by Firishtah says of the Afgháns and other tribes of people in connection with them, which Dow and others make one race of, is contained in this sentence in the original text, p. 29, but it is entirely left out in Dow’s version. Speaking of the Rájah of Láhor sending forces to coerce the Afgháns, he says: “On this occasion, the Khalj, and men of Ghúr *and* Kábul assisted them (the Afgháns).” Now, if these Khalj and Ghúris were Afgháns, as Dow would make out, why does Firishtah, like

many others his predecessors, however, name them separately? The reason is obvious, and he does so correctly.

After the utterance of some erroneous ideas as to why the Afghán country of Akbar's time was called Afghánistán, *centuries before it was so called*, Firishtah says: "The reason why the Hindus call them [the Afgháns] Paṭáns is not known, but it occurs to the mind that during the time of the Musalmán Sultáns [that is, those rulers who were styled Sultáns, prior to Bábar's time], when they [the Afgháns] first came into Hind, they having taken up their abode in the city of Paṭnah, the Hindús styled them Paṭáns." Here he shows his ignorance of the previous history of the Afgháns.

Alluding to the Rájah of Láhor coming to an accommodation with them [p. 30], and giving up to them sundry towns or villages in the Lamghánát, Firishtah says: "the tribe of Khalj, who dwelt in that desert tract [صحرا, in distinction from hill tracts, the more level tracts or plains] as hangers-on upon the Afgháns, he made co-partners [in possession of the lands] with them, on the stipulation that they, the Afgháns, should defend the frontier [of Hind, or his dominions], and not permit Musalmán troops to enter Hindústán. The Afgháns in the hills near Pesháwar constructed a stronghold which they named Khaibar, and, having possessed themselves of the territory of *Roh*, during the sway of the Sámání Maliks, they did not permit them [the Sámánís] to disturb the territory of Láhor, and hence, from first to last, their invasions and ravages were directed towards Sind and Bhaṭíah." Firishtah then proceeds to describe *Roh*, as Afghán writers had previously done, including Khán Jahán Lúdí himself, a contemporary of Firishtah, and the author of a History of the Afgháns, from which work, in all probability, Firishtah took his description. Khán Jahán, who was of the Lúdí tribe of Afgháns, will not be found to have made Turks [including Khaljís] and Ghúris of them, and it may be presumed that he knew something at least about his own ancestor and people, as well as the author of the *Tárikh-i-Sher Sháhi*, which I shall have to refer to.

Firishtah then refers to Sabuk-Tigín, "who was the sipah-sálár of the forces of Alb-Tigín," but such was not the case [as shown in the *Ṭabakát-i-Náṣirí*, page 71], both of which chiefs Dow styles *Subuctagi* and *Abistagi* respectively. Firishtah appears to have been totally unacquainted with the names of Alb-Tigín's son, Is-hák, and of Balká-Tigín, and of Pírey, who held authority over Ghaznín and its dependencies before Sabuk-Tigín. "Sabuk-Tigín," he says, "was powerless in opposing [coercing?] the Afgháns; and afterwards he entered into a good understanding with them; but Mahmúd, his son, subdued and humbled them, put their chiefs to death, and compelled Afgháns to enter his service."

This last statement of Firishtah's, respecting Mahmúd's taking Af-

ghāns into his service, *may be* correct, but it is doubtful, as may be judged from the expeditions against them undertaken by his gallant son Mas'ūd, an account of which I have given from Baihaqī's *Tāriḫ* in my version of the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī*, in note 7, para. 7, page 321, which see.

Firishtah, in his *History*, gives a detailed account of Sabuk-Tigīn's descent, which he took from the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī* verbatim, but this Dow leaves out entirely.

At page 50 of his translation, Dow has the following with reference to Mahmūd :—" In the following year, Mamood led his army towards Ghor. The native prince of that country, Mahommed of the Soor tribe of Afgans, a principality in the mountains famous for giving birth to the Ghorian dynasty." Briggs, in his version of *Firishtah*, follows Dow closely and, in some cases, verbatim, as I have also shown elsewhere; and, in this place, he perpetrates the same blunder; and these two translators are, no doubt, wholly responsible for thus leading their readers astray and causing them to blunder likewise, and to disseminate the incorrect statement that the Afghāns are Ghūrīs, who are Tāziks or Tājiks, and claimed Arab origin. Briggs's version of the passage given above is thus [Vol. 1, p. 49]—" In the following year Mahmood led an army into Ghoor. The native prince of that country, Mahomed of the Afghan tribe of Soor (the same race which gave birth to the dynasty that eventually succeeded in subverting the family of Subooktugeen)," etc.

This statement on the part of Dow and Briggs is evidently the origin of the incorrect assertions of those who have had, and still have, recourse to their versions for materials for Indian history so called; indeed, as a writer in the *Bengal Asiatic Journal*, a few years since, wrote—" Hitherto for the pre-Mughul Muhammadan History of India we have been dependent on *Firishtah*. \* \* \* \* *Elphinstone's History*, for instance, is entirely based on that authority." The writer, however, should have said, dependent on the translators of *Firishtah*; for even where *Firishtah* is right, they have made him wrong. *Elphinstone* certainly quotes Dow and Briggs constantly.

What says *Firishtah* though? He says [p. 46]—" In the year 401 H., the Sultān [Mahmūd], having led an army into Ghūr, the ruler (حاکم) of that country, Muhammad, son of Sūrī [see translation of *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī*, page 321, and note 7-7], with 10,000 men in array, confronted the Sultān's ranks." There is not one word about the " Afghan tribe of Soor" nor the " Soor tribe of Afgans"; and it is from this particular passage in these two translations of *Firishtah* that the error arose of making " Patans" of all the rules of Dihlī down to Sultān Buhlūl of the Lūdī tribe, who is the first Paṭān or Afghān that sat on the throne of Dihlī.

A few lines under the above quotation, *Firishtah* refers to the *Tāriḫ-i-Yamīnī*, and quotes the author of the *Ṭabaḳāt-i-Nāṣirī* with reference to

the conversion of the Ghúris to Islám, and says “but the author of the *Ṭabaḳát-i-Náṣirí* and *Fakhr-ud-Dín Mubárah Sháh the Marw-ar-Rúdí* [see my translation, page 301], who composed a history,” etc.; but Dow leaves this out entirely, and Briggs, such seems the infatuation for viewing all things in a “Patan” light, translates the last part of the sentence [p. 50] “*Fakhr-ood-Deen Mubarik Lody who wrote a history*,” etc. Instead of *Marw-ar-Rúdí* (مرو الرودي), he read *Lúdí* (لودي), the name of Sultán Buhlál’s tribe, which, no doubt, he thought must be correct. People referring to these translations, and finding this statement reiterated, time after time, that the Ghaznawís and Ghúris were “Afgans or Patans”, concluded that *Firishtah* must have so stated, and that he must be right, and so they wrote their accounts of “Patan Sultans,” “Patan buildings,” and “Patan coins,” but they do not seem to have considered that, even if the Ghúris were Patáns, it did not follow that their Turkish slaves, and other Turks, and Tatárs, should also be Patáns. I do not doubt that many Persian scholars will be surprised to hear that there is nothing of the kind whatever in *Firishtah*, any more than there is in any other Asiatic writer, but such is the fact, and *Firishtah*’s text on examination will prove it.

Farther on [p. 132], Dow states: “The genealogy of the kings of Ghor, according to the most authentic historians, could be traced up, by the names, for three and twenty, and downwards nine generations, from Ali to Mamood, the son of Subuctagi,” &c. There is nothing of the kind in *Firishtah*. He renders the names of their ancestors as *Minháji-i-Siráj*, and some others give them, name by name, down to *Zuhák the Tázi*, but Dow not understanding what followed, concealed the “nine generations” down to *Mahmúd of Ghizní*, to whom the Ghúris were no more related than they were to Dow himself. It was from this passage, I have no doubt, the author of “a Student’s Manual of Indian History” was led into the error of calling *Mahmúd of Ghaznín* “the great ancestor” of Sultán *Mu’izz-ud-dín*.

I now pass from the Ghúris and their Turkish slaves, and their slaves, to the *Tughluḳ* dynasty, who are also included among the “Patans” and “Pathans” by English writers who follow Dow and Briggs.

At p. 295, vol. I, Dow says: “We have no true account of the pedigree of *Tuglick*. It is generally believed that his father, whose name was *Tuglick*, had been in his youth brought up as an imperial slave by *Balin*. His mother was one of the tribe of *Jits*. But indeed the pedigrees of the kings of the Patan empire make such a wretched figure in history,” etc. Compare Briggs also here.

*Firishtah* says [page 230]—“The chroniclers of *Hindústán*, both the ancients and the moderns, being negligent, not one of them has recorded with the pen of certainty aught respecting the origin and lineage of the

Ṭughluḳ-Sháhí dynasty. The writer of these pages, Muhammad Kásim Firishtah, when, at the commencement of the reign of Núr-ud-dín Muhammad Jahángír Badsháh, he [Firishtah] on the part of the Sultán of the age, Ibráhím 'A'dil Sháh, reached the city of Láhor, he made inquiry of some persons of that place, who had a predilection for reading the histories of the sovereigns of Hindústán, and who were acquainted with the events [of the reigns] of the Sultáns of Hind, respecting the origin and lineage of the Ṭughluḳ-Sháhí sovereigns. They replied, [saying]—We, likewise, have not seen [anything] distinctly mentioned [on the subject] in any book [Ibn Baḩúṭah's account notwithstanding]; but, in this country [province?] it is currently stated that Malik Ṭughluḳ, the father of the Bádsháh Ghiyás-ud-dín Ṭughluḳ Sháh, was attached to the train of Turk slaves of Sultán Ghiyás-ud-dín Balban, and that he formed a connection with the Jáḩ race, who are the aborigines [بومي—native, homebred, one who has never been abroad] of this country, and espoused a daughter of one of them, and of her the Bádsháh Ghiyás-ud-dín Ṭughluḳ Sháh was born. It is stated in the *Mulhakát* [appendices, additions—the name of a work probably] that the name Ṭughluḳ originally was Ḳutlugh, which word is Turkish; and the people of Hind, from usage, inverted it, and have turned Ḳutlugh into Ṭughluḳ, and some few have turned Ḳutlugh into Ḳutlú." This is all Firishtah says of *this* so-called "Patan" dynasty.

I shall content myself with one more reference to Dow's translation. It is under the reign of the Afghán ruler whom he styles "Shere", p. 159, vol. 2, and in the paragraph alluded to, that he contradicts his own former statements. He says: "The original name of Shere was Ferid. His father was Hussein, of the Soor tribe of the Afghans of Roh." He then attempts to describe Roh, but blunders even in that:—"The original seat of the Afghans was Roh, which, in their language, signifies a mountainous country. It extended, they say, in length, from Sewad and Bijore, to the town of Sui in the dominions of Buckurast." The original is—"to the town of Siwí, which is a dependency of Bakar." Dow turned the proper name "Bakar" and the verb "*ast*", is, into a proper name. He then continues, "and in breadth, from *Hussein to Kabul*." The original is "from Hasan Abdál to Kábul." The Afghán writers, from the earliest down to Háfíz Rahmat Khán, thus describe the extent and boundaries of Roh; in fact, other writers take their descriptions from *Afghán* accounts, but let it be *particularly noticed* that Ghúr is not contained within the boundaries given. Dow then further states: "This tract, in its fertile vallies, contained many separate tribes. Among the number of these was that of Soor, who derive themselves from the princes of Ghor, whose family held the empire after the extinction of the race of Ghizni. One of the sons of the Ghorian family, whose name was Mahommed Soor, having left his native country,

placed himself among the Afghans of Roh, and was the father of the tribe of *Soor*, who was esteemed the noblest among them."

Firishtah's account is vastly different. He says: "The name of Sher Sháh was Faríd, and his father's name Hasan, who is (*sic*) of the people of the Afgháns of Roh. When Sultán Buhlúl Lúdí attained dominion, the father of Hasan, the Súr, who was named Ibráhím, having evinced a desire of obtaining service, came to Dihlí." He then describes Roh, as mentioned above, and adds: "The Afgháns there are of several tribes, among which is the clan of Súr. They account themselves of the posterity of the Sultáns of Ghúr, and say that one of their sons [a son of one of that family] who was called Muhammad Súrí [not Muhammad Súr, but *son* of Súrí], in former days, having been made an exile from his native country,—[If the Afgháns were Ghúris, or the Ghúris Afgháns, as it is pretended, and dwelt in Ghúr, how could this person be an exile from his country among his own people, in his own country? ]—came among the Afgháns of Roh, and, as the correctness of his descent was verified to [the satisfaction of] one of the Afghán chiefs, notwithstanding it is not the custom of Afgháns to give their daughters to strangers, that person [chief or head-man] gave his daughter to Muhammad-i-Súrí, and made him his son-in-law; and, from him offspring having sprung, they became known as the Súr Afgháns [*lit.* Afghánán-i- Súr], and may be the greater of the tribes of the Afgháns."

This is all Firishtah says on the subject, but he has himself misunderstood or confused the Afghan tradition about this son of a Ghúrí chief, with the other tradition about the Ghúris, related by several authors, which I have referred to in note 7, page 321 of my translation of the *Ṭabaqát-i-Náşirí*, which see; and is himself quite wrong in his account of the Afghán tribe of Súr.

The earliest authority known on the descent of the Afgháns, written by Afgháns themselves, is a work, said to have been composed by Shaikh Mali, a distinguished person among the Yúsuf-zí tribe, between 816 H. and 828 H. [Buhlúl Lúdí only came to the throne of Dihlí in 850 H.], and another composed by, or more probably at the command of, Khán Kajú, the celebrated Yúsuf-zí chief of the 100,000 spears "some time after 900 H., nearly half a century before Sher Sháh's obtaining sovereignty, and which two works, written in Pushto, are the basis of the *Tárikh-i-Háfiz Rahmat Khání* and the *Khuláfat-ul-Ansáb* of Háfiz Rahmat himself, both of which I have translated; and in those works there is no mention of the Ghúrí connection. The other works are: The *Tazkirat-ul-Abrár* of Akhund Darwezah, a Tájik like the Ghúris, not an Afghán; the *Tawárikh-i-Ibráhím Sháhí*; the *Tárikh-i-Nisbat-i-Afághinah* of Shaikh 'Abd-ur-Razzák Matí-zí, styled also Bálá Pír, son of the great Shaikh Kásim, whose fine mausoleum may still be seen near the walls of Chanár-garh, as that of Ká-



sim Sulaimání; the *Tárikh-i-Sher-Sháhi* of Shaikh 'Abbás Sarwání; the *Mir-át-ul-Afághinah* of Khán Jahán Lúdí; the *Makhzan Afghání* of Shaikh Ni'mat-ullah; and the *Ansáb-i-Afághinah* of Farid ud-dín Ahmad. The last also is silent on the Ghúrí connection.

The tradition (but not contained in Ferishtah, who quotes a totally different one, given farther on) on which the whole of the sovereigns of Dihlí, from the Turkish slave *Ḳuṭb ud-dín* of the Powerless Finger—and including his master *Mu'izz-ud-dín Muhammad*, son of *Bahá-ud-dín Sám*, since it is because he is considered a "Patan or Afghan," that his Turkish slaves are made "Patans or Afghans" of likewise—down to 'Alá-ud-dín, grandson of *Khizr Khán*, the last of the *Sayyid* dynasty, are all made Patans of, is as follows:—

"In the khiláfat of 'Abd-ul-Malik, son of Marwán [65 H. to 86 H.], *Hajjáj*, son of *Yúsuf us-Ṣakáfi*, was appointed to the leadership of an Arab army assembled for the conquest of *Khurásán* and *Ghúristán*, i. e. *Ghúr*; but some of the works previously quoted differ somewhat, and say that *Muhammad Hárún* was nominated to the command of this army, and also *Muhammad Kásim*, sister's son of *Hajjáj*, son of *Yúsuf*, who was the commander of the forces of *Sulaimán*, son of 'Abd-ul-Malik, son of *Marwán*, in the year 86 H. *Sultán Bahrám*, ruler of *Ghúr*, who was descended from *Zuhák*, the *Tájí* or *Tázi*, and contemporary with the *Khalífah 'Alí*, had proceeded to *Kúfah*, and presented himself before him, and had received from him in writing a grant of the government of *Ghúr*. [See *Ṭabaḳát-i-Náṣiri*, pp. 312, 315, for another version of this.] This *Sultán Bahrám* had two sons. The elder was *Sultán Jalál-ud-dín Muhammad Husain*, from whom is descended, in the third generation, *Muhammad-i-Súrí*. This seems to point to *Muhammad*, son of *Súrí*, mentioned in *Ṭab. Náṣ.* p. 319, who was the great great grandfather of the *Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín Ghúrí*, son of *Sám*, the sovereignty over *Ghúr* being in the elder branch of the family, who overthrew *Rái Pithorá* and slew him, and who introduced *Muhammadanism* into *Hindústán*, and is sometimes called in *Hind* by the name of *Shiháb-ud-dín*. [Compare *Ṭab. Náṣ.*, pp. 302 to 313, and it will be seen whether this agrees with what the annalist of the *Ghúrí Sultáns*, and their contemporary *Maulaná Fakhr-ud-dín Mubárák Sháh* says.] The younger son of *Sultán Bahrám* was named *Jamál-ud-dín Hasan*, who had a son, *Mu'izz-ud-dín Mahmúd*, who again had a son, *Sháh Husain* by name."

Which one of the elder branch was ruler of *Ghúr* on the occasion of Arab invasion, is not said, whether son or grandson of *Sultán Bahrám*; but afterwards it is mentioned that *Kamál-ud-dín Mahmúd*, son of the eldest son of *Bahrám*—*Jalál-ud-dín*—was sent as a hostage to the capital of the *Khalífah Walíd*.

After stating Muhammad-i-Súrí to be the great great grandfather of Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín of Indian renown, they again proceed to state that, "on the authority of the *Tárikh-i-Khurásán* [some say, *Tárikh-i-Khurásání*], the Sultáns of Ghúr are descended from Zuhák, the Tází, in this wise. Sultán Bahrám, son of Jalál-ud-dín, son of Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín, son of Sultán Bahrám, etc., etc." Here the former account seems reversed, and the first Bahrám mentioned would seem to be intended for the so-called *father* of the Sultáns of Ghúr. The writers of this tradition were probably una-<sub>g</sub>re also, that the early rulers of Ghúr were styled Malík, never Sultán and that *the very first* who is styled *Sultán* among the Muhammadan; sovereigns is Mahmúd of Ghazní who was a *Turk*.

"Sháh Mu'izz-ud-dín, father of Sháh Husain [Sháh likewise is neither a title, nor a name occurring among the Ghúrian family], after the subjugation of his country, retired to Makkah, but his son Sháh Husain, separating from his father during these troubles, also left his native country and became an exile. He succeeded in reaching the tents of an Afghán family, which happened to be encamped in the part he first reached, the tribe or chief of which was Shaikh Bataní, or Bah-Taní, or Tabríñ, as he is also styled."

Before relating more of this tradition, I must mention that all the Afgháns, *without any exception whatever*, claim descent from 'Abd-ur-Rashíd-i-Káis al-Laik, who was contemporary with Muhammad the Prophet of Islám, who, they affirm, supported the Prophet's cause, and aided him with his arms, and was styled by Muhammad 'Paţán,' signifying the keel of a vessel; and all his descendants are, on this account, called Paţáns, so the Afghán annalists say; and he is said to have died in the 40th year of H., aged 87 years. Shaikh Bataní or Tabríñ was his son—one of three, *viz.*, Sarí, Ghari, and Tabríñ, who are also respectively styled Sarřaban, Gharghasht, and Bataní or Tabríñ. Such being the fact, as related by *all* Afghán writers, the *tribe* could not have been considerable; in fact, at the time in question, it consisted of three families.

"This noble-born youth", as Sháh Husain is styled, "having reached the tents of Shaikh Bataní's tribe (family), was hospitably received and entertained. He appeared exceedingly devout, and by degrees Bataní, a man of piety and austerity, hence styled Shaikh, took a great liking for him, treated him as a son, made him acquainted with all his affairs, and withheld nothing from him. Bataní's sons, Ismá'il, Ishbún (or Ishpún, as he is also called), and Kajín, treated him as a brother; and, as in the hills there is no concealment of females and no prohibition against seeing and meeting them in their family circle, a secret attachment grew up on the part of Sháh Husain towards Matú, Bataní's daughter; and, at last, matters proceeded to such extremities, that Matú was found to be pregnant by

him. Her mother advised Bataní that Matú should be given to Sháh Husain in marriage before this became known. He demurred, as he did not consider the fugitive youth a suitable match for his daughter. The youth affirmed that his ancestors had been princes of Ghúr, and asked him to send some one into that country and verify the truth of his statement. It was done, and Bataní gave his consent; and, shortly after, Bibí Matú brought forth a son, which, being the fruit of an illicit amour was named Ghal-zoe, *ghal* in the Afghán language signifying 'a thief', and *zoe*, 'a son', therefore signifying 'the thief-son', the illicit son. From this son is said to be descended the great tribe of Ghalzí (*zí*, applied to the tribe is plural of *zoe*), numbering, at this period, in all its divisions and subdivisions, near upon half a million of souls, and one of the two most numerous tribes of all the Afghán race.

Another history in my possession, which I have not mentioned above among the others, and the author of which was a member of the *royal tribe*—the Sado-zís, the tribe to which the late Sháh Shujá'-ul-Mulk belonged. He besides quoting his own Afghán authorities, mentions the Tawárikh-i-Saláftín-i-Lúdíah wa Súríah-i-Afághinah, and the Risálah-i-Akhhár-i-Khadkah, and gives a detailed account of the early history of the Afgháns. The author styles Matú's father Tabríñ only, never by the name of Bataní, and merely mentions that *one of Tabríñ's daughters* had a son before the nuptial knot was tied, and adds "*and it is said that there was an illicit connexion between her and Mast 'Alí Ghúrí,*" whoever he may have been, but he does not, in consequence, turn the Ghúris into "Afgháns or Patans". The Ghalzís, on the other hand, deny altogether the truth of this tradition.

Before mentioning anything more respecting Sháh Husain, the "noble-born" Ghúrí youth, and the sons he is said to have been the father of, on the authority of this tradition, I must by the following short table show, from the tradition itself, what relationship existed between the said Sháh Husain, by virtue of whose *traditional* connection with Bataní's, or Tabríñ's daughter, Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín Muhammad, son of Bahá-ud-dín Sâm, the conqueror of Rái Pithorá, and the Ghúrí Sultáns, before and after him, are all turned into Afgháns likewise, and not only they, but their Turkish slaves, and their slaves, and slave's slaves likewise.

Sultán Bahrám.

[contemporary of the Khalífah 'Alí,] descendant of Zuhák, the Tází or Tájí.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. <i>Eldest son</i>, Jalál-ud-dín Muham-mad Husain.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p>2. Kamál-ud-dín Mahmúd, who was sent as hostage to Walíd.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p>3. Son, nameless, [but as <i>his</i> son is called Muhammad-i-Súrí, it is presumed therefore <i>by me</i>, to be Súrí], great great-grandfather of the last mentioned under.</p> <p>4. Son, nameless.</p> <p>5. Son, nameless.</p> <p>6. Son, nameless.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p>7. Mu'izz-ud-dín Muhammad, son of Bahá-ud-dín Sám, Sultán of Ghaznín, assassinated 602 H.</p> | <p>1. <i>Youngest son</i>, Jamál-ud-dín Hasan.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> </p> <p>2. Sháh Mu'izz-ud-dín Mahmúd, who retired to Makkah.</p> <p>3. Sháh Husain [contemporary with Hajjáj, appointed to administer the government of Khurásán, 78 H.], <i>who had Bibí Matú to wife</i>.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">┌──────────────────────────────────┐</p> <p>1, Ghalzí. 2, Ibráhím, surnamed Lúdí, properly Lo-e-day, "he is eldest", he being the eldest legitimate son; and 3, Síání.</p> |
|---|--|

Now what relationship existed between Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín Muhammad, son of Bahá-ud-dín Sám, conqueror of Rái Pithorá, and establisher of the Muhammadan power in Hindústán, whose descent is traced to Zuhák, the Tází, (*i. e.*, *Arab*: by Persian-speaking people Tájí, whence comes the name Tázík and Tájik, by which name the greater number of the *non-Afghán* people of those tracts are still known. See Tab. Náş., page 301) and the descendants of Bibí Matú's sons, whose father, by this tradition, Sháh Husain was? Is there the slightest shadow of a reason why, even if this tradition were true, the rulers of Ghúr, whether Maliks or Sultáns, should be styled, as at page 50, Vol. 1, of Dow's version of Firishtah, "Muhammad of the Súr tribe of Afgháns, and in Brigg's version, page 50, Vol. 1, "Muhammad of the Afghán tribe of Súr"? and is there the most remote shadow of a reason why Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín's Turkish slave should be styled "the founder" of the Afghán or "Patán" dynasty of Dihlí, and all those *Turkish slaves, and descendants of Turkish slaves, the Khalj Turks, and the Sayyids* who trace their descent to Husain, grandson of Muhammad the Prophet, and are acknowledged by all Muhammadans to be his descendants—twenty rulers in all—should be styled the "Patan" or "Pathán" kings of Dihlí?

From the error of calling the Ghúrí Sultáns "*Patans or Afgháns*" emanates another error equally great; but, in this instance, it is the turning of Afgháns into Turks! Wherever the Khalj tribe are referred to throughout Firishtah's work, Dow styles them 'Chilligies', which is the name of no people, tribe, or race on the face of the earth, and in this he is followed by Maurice and some others; but Briggs styles them by nearly their correct name, at least, for they are called Khaljí as well as Khalj; but

other writers have at once jumped at the conclusion and some even shortly maintain that they are Ghalzís. For example, Mr. J. C. Marshman, who has written a History of India, “at the request of the University of Calcutta” and who says, “so far as historical truth can be discovered,” he is “prepared to vouch for the accuracy of the facts detailed in it,” calls them GHILJIES:—(page 53, Vol. 1) “the Afghán mountaineers of Ghuzni and Ghore, denominated the Ghiljies”. There is certainly a great similarity between the mode of writing the name of the Afghán tribe of Ghalzí غلزي and the Turkish tribe of Khalj خالچ, Khaljí خالچي.

What Firishtah does say respecting the descent of the Afgháns, but which is very different from *their* tradition previously given, is this: “When Khálid, the son of 'Abdullah, was removed from the government of Kábul, (other authors of much greater authority than Firishtah relate differently, however) finding it difficult and dangerous to return into 'Irák-i-'Arab through fear of the newly appointed governor, under the guidance of the chiefs of Kábul, he proceeded into the Sulaimán mountains, which lie between Multán and Pesháwar and between many other places, accompanied by his family and a party of Arab followers, and therein took up his residence. He gave one of his daughters in marriage to one of the chief men among the Afgháns there, who had become Musalmáns. From this *daughter* of the 'Arab, Khálid sprung offspring who multiplied and acquired great repute. One of these was Lúdí, and another Súr; and the Afgháns come from that party of 'Arabs above mentioned. In a work, entitled Matla'-ul-Anwár, composed by one among the trustworthy, which Firishtah perused at Burhánpúr in Khándesh, it was written that the Afgháns are Kibťiah (Copts)”, &c., &c., and there occur other statements foreign to this subject.

The same writer also makes a statement with respect to the Lúdí tribe, Vol. 1, p. 69 which is equally as incorrect as the preceding, and would cause some astonishment, as well as ridicule, among the people referred to. He says:—“Beloli was an Afghan of the tribe of Lodi, now known as the Lohani, which is engaged chiefly in the conveyance of merchandise between Hindustan and Persia.” Nothing of the sort. Súr, son of Ismá'íl, who was the progenitor of the tribe of that name, had two brothers, each the progenitors of separate tribes, one of whom was named Núh, and he is the progenitor of the tribe of Núhání, which name has been corrupted into Lúhání. These are the people who act as the great carriers of merchandise in Central Asia.

Elphinstone in his History correctly states that the Kháljis were a Turkish tribe, long connected with the Afgháns, as Firishtah himself mentions, and does not confound them with the Afghanistan of Ghazni, of whom he gives a good account in his “Caulul.”

The 'Masálik ul-Mamálik' states that "the Khalj are a tribe of Turks, which in former days—this work was written long before the time of Mahmúd of Ghazní—settled in Garmsír, between Sijistán and the region of Hind. They are in appearance and dress like Turks, and observe the customs of that race, and all speak the Turkí language." The same work also states in two or three places, that there is a town called Khalj in that part; and in the account of Jáj, also Cháj, of Máwar-án-Nahr says that it is a populous and flourishing city, the people of which are Ghuzz and Khalj, all Musalmáns of the sect of Ghází.

The Ghalzís, so called after the illicit son of the tradition of Bibí Matú and Sháh Husain, have no tribe, subdivision, or family among them styled either "Lodí" or "Súr"; but two other sons were born to Bibí Matú, one of whom was named Ibráhím, who is surnamed Lo-e-daey, signifying in the Afghán language "(he) is great or elder", respecting which name a tradition is attached which need not be related here. It has been corrupted or rather shortened, into Lodí and Lúdí, and Ibráhím is the progenitor of the Lúdí tribe. From him sprung two sons, one of whom, named Síání, had two sons, Pránkí and Ismá'íl. Pránkí is the ancestor, eight generations back, of Buhlúl, of the Sháhú Khel, a clan of the Lúdí tribe, who, according to the authors I have been quoting, and as all educated Afgháns themselves will affirm, was the first of the race of 'Abd-ur-Rashíd Paṭán that attained sovereign power. He is the founder of the Lúdíah dynasty, but the thirtieth ruler of Dihilí, counting from Ẓuṭb-ud-dín, the Turkish slave of the Tájik Sultán Mu'izz-ud-dín Muhammad, son of Babá-ud-dín Sám Ghúrí.

From Ismá'íl, brother of Pránkí and son of Síání, son of Lúdí, sprung two sons, one of whom was named Súr, who had four sons, from one of whom, Yúnas by name, in the ninth generation, descended Farid, afterwards Sher Sháh, who dethroned the second Mughul emperor Humáyún, and was the first of the Súr division of the Lúdí tribe who attained sovereignty; and Ahmad Khán, son of Saidú, afterwards Sultán Sikandar, his kinsman, was the last of the Afghán or Paṭán dynasty. The name Súr appears to have struck those who were in search of a mare's-nest, and they at once jumped at the conclusion, that, as Súrí was the name of one of the Tájik chiefs of Ghúr, and Ghúr lay near the tract then occupied by the Afgháns, the Ghúris must be Afgháns or Paṭáns and the Afgháns Ghúris, and so this error has been handed down from one writer to another up to this present day. Although Firishtah falls into error in supposing Súrí and Súr to be the same name and to refer to the same person, he never turns Ghúris and Turks into Afgháns or Paṭáns.

One example more and I have done. At page 197, Vol. 2, Dow, under the reign of Ibráhím Súr, says: "In the mean time, Muhammad

(*sic*) of the Afghan family of Ghor, governor of Bengal, rebelled against Muhammad". Here again we have his own ideas inserted, for Firishtah knew better than to utter such an absurdity. That author expresses himself in these words under the reign of Muhammad Sháh, nicknamed Andhlí, 'the intellectually blind'. "At this period, Muhammad Khán Súr, ruler of Bangálah, having raised the standard of hostility," &c. Dow turns the kings of Gujarát and the Bahrí rulers of Ahmadnagar into Patáns likewise. Under the reign of Salím Sháh, he says, (Vol. 2, p. 191) when mentioning his death: "In the same year, Mahmud, the Patan king of Guzerat, [He was the descendant of a Ták Rájput from near Thánesar] and the Nizám of the Deccan, who was of the same nation, died." Compare Briggs here also. Firishtah's words are these: "In this very same year, Mahmúd Sháh Gujarátí, and Burhán Nizám-ul-Mulk Bahrí, likewise died." This Burhán-ul-Mulk was the son of Ahmad Nizám Sháh, the founder of the Bahrí dynasty and of the city of Ahmadnagar, who was the son of a Bráhman of Bījánagar who being taken captive in his childhood, was made a Musalmán of, and brought up as one of the slaves of Sultán Ahmad Sháh Bahmaní."

The renowned Afghán chief and poet Khushhál Khán, of the Khaṭak tribe, mentions the two Afghán dynasties in one of his poems. See my 'Poetry of the Afgháns', page 197,—

"The whole of the deeds of the Paṭáns are better than those of the Mughuls;

But they have no unity among them, and a great pity it is.

The fame of Buhlúl and of Sher Sháh, too, resoundeth in my ears—

Afghán emperors of India who swayed the sceptre effectually and well.

For six or seven generations did they govern so wisely,

That all their people were filled with admiration of them."

